

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATHONS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FIL | ING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/623,937 | 10/623,937 07/18/2003 | | Hironobu Murakami | 4041J-000744 | 6491 | |
| 27572 | 7590 | 02/24/2004 | | EXAMINER | | |
| HARNESS P.O. BOX 8 | • | & PIERCE, P.L | BOLES, | BOLES, DEREK | | |
| | | , MI 48303 | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| , | | | | 3749 | 3749 | |
| | | | | | | |

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| • | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
| | 10/623,937 | MURAKAMI ET AL. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Derek S. Boles | 3749 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | pears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timey within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE | nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 Ju | uly 2003. | | | | | |
| <u> </u> | s action is non-final. | | | | | |
| · | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | wn from consideration. | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 July 2003 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj | e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12) △ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) △ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. △ Certified copies of the priority document 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | es have been received. Es have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | on No ed in this National Stage | | | | |
| Attachment(s) 1) \(\sum \) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) 🔲 Interview Summary | (PTO-413) | | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Da | ate | | | | |
| Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/18/03. | 6) Other: | atent Application (PTO-152) | | | | |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the cover member must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim(s) 1, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al. (6,499,508) in view of Fujiwara (6,669,548). Sato et al. discloses all of the limitations of the claim(s) except for the periphery wall having a projected portion. Fujiwara discloses the presence of a periphery wall having a projected portion. See **26a** and col. 5, lines 11-23. Hence, one skilled in the art would find it obvious to modify the system of Sato et al. to include the projected portion of Fujiwara for the purpose of noise attenuation.

Claim(s) 2 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al. in view of Fujiwara and in further view of Toyoshima et al. (6,622,787). Sato et al. in view of Fujiwara discloses all of the limitations of the claim(s) except for the location of the HVAC

Art Unit: 3749

device being adjacent the cowl of an automobile. Toyoshima et al. discloses the presence of an HVAC device being adjacent the cowl of an automobile. See 35. Hence, one skilled in the art would find it obvious to modify the system of Sato et al. in view of Fujiwara to include a HVAC device being adjacent the cowl of an automobile of Toyoshima et al. for the purpose of reduction in parts and/or fresher inlet air.

Claim(s) 7 and 9-11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara in view of Sumiya et al. (5,676,595). Fujiwara discloses all of the limitations of the claim(s) except for an elastic sealing member being disposed to create a seal between the intermediate wall and the periphery wall when the rotary door is in an air mixing position. Sumiya et al. discloses the presence of a seal between the intermediate wall and the periphery wall when the rotary door is in an air mixing position. See 5-7. Hence, one skilled in the art would find it obvious to modify the system of Fujiwara to include the seal between the intermediate wall and the periphery wall when the rotary door is in an air mixing position of Sumiya et al. for the purpose of reducing an influx of contaminants regardless of door position. Regarding claims 9 and 11, see col. 6, lines 50-64 and col. 2, lines 4-24 of Fujiwara, respectfully.

Claim(s) 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara in view of Sumiya et al. and in further view of Toyoshima et al. See claim 2, above.

device being adjacent the cowl of an automobile. Toyoshima et al. discloses the presence of an HVAC device being adjacent the cowl of an automobile. See 35. Hence, one skilled in the art would find it obvious to modify the system of Sato et al. in view of Fujiwara to include a HVAC device being adjacent the cowl of an automobile of Toyoshima et al. for the purpose of reduction in parts and/or fresher inlet air.

Claim(s) 7 and 9-11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara in view of Sumiya et al. (5,676,595). Fujiwara discloses all of the limitations of the claim(s) except for an elastic sealing member being disposed to create a seal between the intermediate wall and the periphery wall when the rotary door is in an air mixing position. Sumiya et al. discloses the presence of a seal between the intermediate wall and the periphery wall when the rotary door is in an air mixing position. See 5-7. Hence, one skilled in the art would find it obvious to modify the system of Fujiwara to include the seal between the intermediate wall and the periphery wall when the rotary door is in an air mixing position of Sumiya et al. for the purpose of reducing an influx of contaminants regardless of door position. Regarding claims 9 and 11, see col. 6, lines 50-64 and col. 2, lines 4-24 of Fujiwara, respectfully.

Claim(s) 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara in view of Sumiya et al. and in further view of Toyoshima et al. See claim 2, above.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The provided references are representative of the state of the art that is applicable to the applicant's invention. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Derek S. Boles at (703) 308-1804 or fax number (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0861. The Supervisory Primary Examiner for Art Unit 3749 is Ira Lazarus who can be reached at (703) 308-1935.

Application/Control Number: 10/623,937

Art Unit: 3749

D.S.B.

2/23/04

DEREK S. BOLES
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 3700

Page 4